DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 230 090 HE 016 151

TITLE	The Core Student Affirmative Action Program at the California State University. A Second Review.
INSTITUTION	California State Postsecondary Education Commission, Sacramento.
PUB DATE	Jan 83
NOTE	25p.
AVAILABLE FROM	California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Affirmative Action; *College Students; Coordination; Enrollment Trends; *Minority Groups; *Outreach Programs; Postsecondary Education; Program Costs; State Aid; *State Universities; *Student Recruitment
IDENTIFIERS	*California State University

ABSTRACT

A second review of the core student affirmative action program at the California State University is presented. The review was conducted to assess: (1) progress in implementing the program on each of the campuses; (2) the impact of the expanded outreach efforts; and (3) the success of the program in coordinating existing outreach services, resources, and personnel on each campus. Attention is directed to the quality of outreach staff employed by the state university campuses; the enrollment of minorities from outreach high schools; the amount of campus financial support; and program coordination. Progress data are presented for individual campuses. The following strengths of the program are considered: total institutional involvement in affirmative action; allocation of state money to campuses making the most progress and commitment; annual publication of information about the program; rural outreach efforts; and the use of successful nontraditional outreach strategies. Areas where further progress is needed include: conflict between the core program as a comprehensive concept and as separate services, time consuming and unnecessary annual funding, and inadequate implementation of a comprehensive effort on some campuses. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED230090

THE CORE STUDENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAM AT THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

A Second Review

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Calif Postsecondary

~~Education Commission~~

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

HE016151

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 95814

Commission Report 83-5

January 1983

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
HISTORY OF THE PROGRAM	2
PROGRESS IN PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION	7
STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM	15
AREAS WHERE FURTHER PROGRESS IS NEEDED	17
SUMMARY	19

TABLES

		Page
1.	Core Program Expenditures and Awards by Campus, 1980-81	4-5
2.	Number of Individuals Served by the Core Student Affirmative Action Program, 1980-81 -- 1981-82	6
3.	California State University Enrollments and Percent of Selected Ethnic Minority Students in the High School Student Body, Service-Area Population, Campus Student Body, and Among Baccalaureate Degree Recipients, 1980-81	8-9
4.	Non-Response Rate for Ethnicity Data Among California State University Campuses, Fall 1981	10
5.	Assessment of Core Outreach Staff and Activities on High School Campuses by School Counselors and Staff	12
6.	College-Going Rates for Underrepresented Ethnic Minority Students Graduating from Secondary Schools Served by the Core Program, Fall 1980 Compared to Fall 1981	13

THE CORE STUDENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAM AT THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

A Second Review

INTRODUCTION

The Core Student Affirmative Action Program is designed to respond to the underrepresentation of ethnic minorities in The California State University. Beginning in September 1980, all 19 campuses of the system implemented the program with approximately $1.9 million in State General Fund support. Each campus was invited to develop a proposal to augment its existing equal educational opportunity efforts through increased activity and coordination of resources in four major areas: (1) intensive outreach at the undergraduate and graduate levels; (2) expansion of basic retention efforts; (3) in-service training opportunities for faculty and staff in such areas as cultural sensitivity, interracial communication, and women's and ethnic minority perspectives; and (4) improvement in preparatory and in-service programs for secondary school teachers, counselors, and other staff.

The California Postsecondary Education Commission has been directed by the Legislature to evaluate the Core Program. Its initial review, published in July 1981, concluded:

> In general, the Core Student Affirmative Action Program is being implemented as proposed on the 19 campuses of the State University. As should be anticipated with the initiation of a new program of this scope, some campuses have made considerably more progress than others. However, the majority of the campuses are demonstrating substantial institutional commitment and fiscal contribution to the program.

The purposes of this second Commission review are to assess (1) the progress which has been made during the past year in implementing the program on each of the campuses, (2) the impact of the expanded outreach efforts, and (3) the success of the program in coordinating existing outreach services, resources, and personnel on each campus. A third and final comprehensive evaluation of the Core Program will be completed prior to September 1983.

HISTORY OF THE PROGRAM

The State University established a formal student affirmative action program in fall 1978, with pilot outreach efforts on three campuses--Dominguez Hills, Fresno, and San Jose. With $100,000 in State General Fund support and $30,000 from the Chancellor's Office, these pilot projects experimented with new approaches to outreach. In 1979-80, this pilot effort was expanded with $730,000 in State General Fund support to (1) continue the special outreach projects on the Dominguez Hills, Fresno, and San Jose campuses; (2) establish on the four campuses located in the Los Angeles Basin a unique regional outreach effort in conjunction with the Los Angeles Unified School District; and (3) establish on two other campuses regional outreach approaches for students in rural settings.

Based upon the experience and expertise gained during these initial two years, the Legislature provided $1,875,878 in State General Fund support to establish a "Core Student Affirmative Action" effort on all 19 campuses. Each campus developed a plan designed to coordinate and expand, where necessary, existing services, resources, personnel, and policies within the areas of outreach, retention/supportive services, and educational enhancement. Through a competitive proposal review process, available funds were allocated among the 19 campuses on the basis of 60 percent for outreach, 30 percent for retention, and 10 percent for faculty inservice training and programs for school personnel, with the funding levels ranging from a low of $57,900 to $131,000. (Representatives from the Department of Finance, Legislative Budget Committee, and the Postsecondary Education Commission were invited to participate in the proposal review process.)

In 1981-82, State General Fund support was increased by approximately $400,000, with additional funding targeted for expanded retention and educational enhancement, and funds allocated 40 percent, 40 percent, and 20 percent, respectively, for outreach, retention, and educational enhancement. Campus funding levels ranged from $30,000 to a high of $183,673. In addition, five CSU campuses (Chico, Dominguez Hills, Northridge, San Jose, and Sonoma) were selected to initiate pilot retention referral centers beginning in fall 1981. Each campus received a grant of approximately $67,000, with this allocation in addition to the regular campus funding for Core. The purpose of this pilot retention effort is to establish on the campus a central referral agency which could (a) act as a primary point of contact and needs assessment or diagnosis for the students, (b) be responsible for identifying the best or most appropriate service available to meet the student's specific need, and (c) track the student to be sure he/she is receiving all of the needed services. The retention centers are expected to act as a centralized coordinating agency to increase the efficiency of existing supportive services.

In 1982-83, State funding for the entire Core Program will increase to approximately $2,200,000, with campus awards ranging from $50,618 to a high of $166,000. In addition, the five pilot retention referral centers will be continued at the same campuses as in 1981-82. (Table 1 on pp. 4-5 lists campus awards and expenditures for all three years.)

The Core approach has seven basic elements: (1) outreach efforts directed to the family unit; (2) expanded direct relations between the University and the minority community; (3) use of nontraditional, culturally sensitive media, and information dissemination practices; (4) development of a more supportive college environment; (5) faculty and staff in-service activities; (6) intersegmental cooperation between high schools, Community Colleges, the University of California, and other postsecondary institutions; and (7) improvement and augmentation of counselor and teacher education programs. According to data supplied by the Chancellor's Office, more than 52,000 individuals have been served each year through Core. (Table 2 on page 6 lists the numbers served by each activity for the past two years.)

The State University campuses vary considerably in their levels of enrollment of Chicano, Black, and American Indian students. Compared to the ethnic composition of either the general population within the campuses' service area or the total high school student body within that area, only the San Bernardino campus has achieved this level of representation of each ethnic minority group. These data, which should be used as only approximate measures of relative participation rates for ethnic minority students, are summarized for each campus in Table 3 on pp. 8-9. In brief:

- Compared to the ethnic composition of either the general population within the campuses' service area or the total high school student body within that area, Chicano students are underrepresented on all State University campuses except Humboldt. The degree of underrepresentation is the largest at the Fresno, Northridge, San Diego, and San Luis Obispo campuses.

- The proportion of Black students in the State University system at large generally matches that of Blacks among high school graduates. However, using the same comparison base as described above for Chicano students, Black students are underrepresented on six of the 19 campuses--Long Beach, Los Angeles, Northridge, Pomona, San Luis Obispo, and Sonoma.

- Data concerning participation rates by American Indian students are particularly unreliable, given the relatively small size of this ethnic group. Consequently no conclusions can be made on a campus-by-campus basis. However, the Humboldt campus has the

TABLE 1 Core Program Expenditures and Awards by Campus, 1980-81

Campus	1980-81 Number of Positions	1980-81 Matching Contribution	1980-81 Award
Bakersfield	3.5	$ 5,124	$ 69,963
Chico	4.3	1,410	69,640
Dominguez Hills	8.5	29,250	131,492
Fresno	7.8	35,056	127,272
Fullerton	3.9	55,076	99,443
Hayward	4.4	12,800	73,730
Humboldt	3.5	23,550	95,079
Long Beach	6.7	17,555	112,233
Los Angeles	6.4	27,758	104,472
Northridge	7.3	22,198	123,016
Pomona	4.5	45,075	67,958
Sacramento	7.9	53,725	122,794
San Bernardino	4.6	0	84,117
San Diego	3.6	21,590	59,540
San Francisco	3.6	0	67,531
San Jose	6.0	24,978	108,988
San Luis Obispo	4.5	4,325	87,710
Sonoma	4.2	16,490	95,353
Stanislaus	3.6	10,618	81,839
TOTAL	98.8	$406,578	$1,782,170
Ret/Ref Center Pilots			$ 0
C.O. SAA Unit			99,658
Reserve for 82-83 Midyear allocation:			0
TOTALS:			$1,881,828

Note: Actual campus contributions are available only for 1981-82. The stated campus contribution indicates the amount expected to be

Source: California State University Chancellor's Office.

to 1982-83

1981-82			Proposed 1982-83		
Number of Positions	Matching Contribution	Award	Number of Positions	Matching Contribution	Award
3.8	$ 10,164	$ 86,827	3.4	$ 16,910	$ 80,000
5.6	52,636	107,509	5.0	79,325	99,312
6.3	17,819	130,655	6.1	36,943	114,983
7.4	126,411	161,280	7.5	110,320	154,387
9.0	91,185	183,673	7.0	75,396	159,612
4.5	31,295	86,823	4.3	32,437	99,939
3.1	2,000	82,028	2.5	16,768	69,793
7.0	61,932	135,798	6.6	66,742	125,277
7.1	31,058	127,384	6.8	40,906	130,784
6.7	33,333	117,173	4.2	40,903	99,953
5.8	55,786	100,892	4.9	63,652	90,304
8.3	79,571	159,520	9.2	106,784	165,879
3.0	13,795	68,925	3.4	12,964	79,548
5.6	26,654	109,824	3.0	25,454	80,095
1.0	27,794	42,091	3.6	50,000	100,042
6.6	10,000	127,861	5.5	25,316	125,479
1.0	30,112	31,631	3.3	97,116	129,090
4.0	29,155	84,824	4.5	45,335	104,540
1.0	16,834	30,000	2.0	10,000	50,618
96.8	$747,534	$1,974,718	92.8	$953,271	$2,059,635
		$ 332,552			$ 325,000
		82,211			112,000
		0			61,854
		$2,389,481			$2,558,489

allocated by the campus at the start of the 1980-81 and 1982-83 academic years.

TABLE 2 Number of Individuals Served by the Core Student Affirmative Action Program, 1980-81 -- 1981-82

Activity	1980-81	1981-82
OUTREACH		
Home Visits	1,157	592
Campus Tours	7,260	6,455
Sponsored Workshops	3,970	11,295
Cultural Events	8,982	4,588
Students Served at School Sites	27,730	28,828
Presentations to Clubs and Churches	11,157	11,286
TOTAL PARTICIPANTS*	65,256	63,044
RETENTION		
Academic Advising	940	1,376
Counseling	177	889
Tutoring	529	546
Peer Mentoring	400	508
Faculty Mentoring	139	344
Orientation	246	966
Workshops	730	1,047
Cultural Events	8,583	4,549
Referrals	899	1,386
Learning Assistance	73	161
Testing	49	88
Miscellaneous	307	158
TOTAL PARTICIPANTS*	13,074	12,018
EDUCATIONAL ENHANCEMENT		
CSU Students	3,015	2,958
Parents	40	274
High School and Community College Faculty and Staff	1,208	1,206
CSU Faculty Members	953	1,281
CSU Staff Members	740	350
CSU Administrators	279	393
Others	346	792
TOTAL PARTICIPANTS*	6,581	7,254

*"Total Participants" may count the same individuals more than once if they participated in more than one activity. Thus the figures in this table are higher than the total of 52,000 unduplicated participants mentioned in the text.

Source: California State University Chancellor's Office. For more data and analysis, see its 1980-81 Funded Student Affirmative Action Projects in the California State University: Activities and Accomplishments (December 1981).

largest American Indian enrollment of any in California within its service area, and it is clear that this ethnic group is underrepresented on that campus.

Analyses of the impact of student affirmative action programs within the State University system are handicapped by poor data collection on many of the campuses which results in incomplete information on the ethnic composition of the student body. While progress has been made in this area during the past two years, some campuses continue to be unable to report the ethnicity of large numbers of their students. As Table 4 at the top of page 10 shows, in Fall 1981, the Fresno, Los Angeles, Pomona, San Francisco, and San Luis Obispo campuses reported particularly high proportions of their first-time freshmen and incoming transfer students as "ethnicity unknown." The Sacramento, Los Angeles, and San Jose campuses had the largest nonresponse rate for their entire student bodies. Part of the reason for this high nonresponse rate is that many institutions solicit student ethnicity declarations as part of their first-time admission or first day of registration procedures. From both the students' and the institutions' standpoint, such efforts could probably not come at a more untimely moment, and consequently student ethnicity declarations are frequently either ignored or lost.

PROGRESS IN PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

The Core Program has now completed two years of operation. While it is premature to evaluate its overall success, judgments can be made about its relative progress thus far. At least five specific questions can be answered:

- Are the outreach staff employed by the State University campuses reliable, well trained, and effective in working with high school students?
- Has the number of minority students who enroll in college increased from those high schools served by State University outreach staff?
- Has campus financial support for the program increased?
- Are campus outreach activities adequately coordinated by Educational Opportunity Programs, Office of Relations with Schools, and Student Affirmative Action staff?
- Is intersegmental coordination of outreach being promoted and achieved?

TABLE 3 California State University Enrollments and Percent of Selected Ethnic Minority Students in the High School

Campus	Total Campus Enrollment Fall 1981	Chicano and Other Hispanic High School Percent	Service Area Percent	Fall 1981 Campus Percent	BA Degrees Percent
Bakersfield	3,400	20.3%	19.7%	11.8%	11.0%
Chico	14,276	---	5.8	4.2	3.7
Dominguez Hills	8,269	14.3	---	9.3	8.2
Fresno	16,243	33.4	25.2	13.9	9.6
Fullerton	23,284	---	15.5	8.8	7.6
Hayward	11,483	7.2	11.4	6.6	5.2
Humboldt	7,460	1.9	4.4	3.1	2.6
Long Beach	31,928	19.7	22.7	9.3	6.4
Los Angeles	22,180	24.3	23.4	---	19.3
Northridge	28,026	27.0	29.8	9.3	7.3
Pomona	16,170	23.3	18.3	12.3	9.7
Sacramento	22,662	---	9.8	---	4.0
San Bernardino	4,961	15.7	14.7	---	17.2
San Diego	33,714	20.9	14.4	8.0	6.7
San Francisco	24,467	7.0	12.3	7.0	4.7
San Jose	24,945	12.1	11.7	8.8	6.7
San Luis Obispo	16,392	20.4	18.3	4.5	2.4
Sonoma	5,423	---	17.7	4.5	3.0
Stanislaus	4,283	17.4	16.2	9.0	8.0

Note: Dashes indicate that accurate data are not available.

Source: Data for the high school percent (which includes all grade levels within the high school) and service-area population were prepared by the California State University Chancellor's Office using data from the 1979-80 academic year. Data for

Student Body, Service-Area Population, Campus Student Body, and Among Baccalaureate Degree Recipients, 1980-81

Black				American Indian			
High School Percent	Service Area Percent	Fall 1981 Campus Percent	BA Degrees Percent	High School Percent	Service Area Percent	Fall 1981 Campus Percent	BA Degrees Percent
5.4%	4.1%	8.6%	3.8%	1.9%	---	---	---
---	1.1	2.1	0.5	---	2.1%	1.3%	0.8%
36.5	---	41.0	36.0	0.5	---	3.1	2.4
4.8	4.1	4.0	2.2	1.2	---	1.4	1.0
---	2.8	3.2	1.8	---	0.4	---	0.6
11.6	12.3	12.9	11.0	0.4	0.5	2.7	2.0
0.8	0.7	0.5	0.2	4.8	2.8	3.1	1.1
13.4	14.6	9.8	6.1	0.4	0.7	3.1	1.3
20.4	18.2	---	12.5	1.3	0.9	---	7.0
24.7	27.6	7.1	3.7	0.5	---	2.4	1.2
8.7	10.8	4.0	3.1	0.4	0.3	1.3	2.0
---	5.8	---	5.0	---	---	---	2.0
5.7	4.6	---	9.0	0.5	1.4	---	2.0
1.9	4.3	4.3	2.1	0.5	---	2.2	1.2
11.4	9.3	9.7	7.5	0.3	0.2	1.8	1.2
3.9	3.9	6.9	5.0	0.3	0.3	3.4	2.0
3.8	3.8	1.5	0.7	0.8	---	0.9	0.9
---	6.8	4.3	3.0	---	1.0	2.5	1.5
0.5	3.6	4.9	4.3	---	---	1.8	1.4

the campus percent and the baccalaureate degree recipient percent are from the Commission's Information System. The baccalaureate degree data are for academic year 1980-81, while the enrollment data are for Fall 1981.

To address these questions, Commission staff reviewed reports and proposals submitted by each campus to the Chancellor's Office, talked with Program coordinators and staff on most of the campuses, reviewed data provided by the Commission's Information Systems Unit, and surveyed counselors and staff at 120 high schools served

TABLE 4 Non-Response Rate for Ethnicity Data Among California State University Campuses, Fall 1981

Campus	First-Time Freshmen	New Transfer Students	All Students
Bakersfield	4.8%	4.5%	17.3%
Chico	2.0	1.8	4.9
Dominguez Hills	3.6	2.4	5.2
Fresno	27.5	15.4	14.5
Fullerton	5.0	4.6	11.4
Hayward	4.4	2.9	4.9
Humboldt	5.3	5.4	15.1
Long Beach	4.6	2.7	10.8
Los Angeles	33.8	50.8	31.3
Northridge	6.2	6.3	14.4
Pomona	20.5	55.6	18.6
Sacramento	5.1	4.0	36.3
San Bernardino	4.6	4.5	13.8
San Diego	2.0	1.8	3.2
San Francisco	43.0	38.8	21.7
San Jose	7.3	6.1	25.7
San Luis Obispo	27.9	30.4	18.3
Sonoma	3.4	4.4	12.6
Stanislaus	3.6	1.8	3.5
TOTAL	12.2%	16.3%	15.5%

Source: California Postsecondary Education Commission Information System

by the Core Program (98 percent of all 131 schools). These efforts yielded the following findings:

Quality of Outreach Staff

Ninety-six percent of the high school counselors and staff who were surveyed rated the Core outreach counselors as reliable and well trained, and 97 percent rated the Core outreach services as either "helpful" or "extremely useful." Eighty-four percent of the respondents reported that the Core staff were "good" or "excellent," as compared to other outreach staff from local colleges; only 4 percent rated them as "average;" and a mere 1 percent deemed them "poor." (See Table 5 on page 12 for a campus-by-campus report of these data.)

Increased Enrollment of Minorities from Outreach High Schools

The number of Chicano and Black students who enroll in college after graduating from high schools served by the outreach component of the Core Program has increased. The Core Program began its outreach services in the 1980-81 academic year. To assess the impact of these services, the Commission staff compared the college-going rate from each high school for Fall 1980 (prior to the start of outreach services) with that for Fall 1981 (after the first year of the services). Approximately 60 percent of the 110 schools for which data are available demonstrated an increase in the numbers of Chicanos and Blacks enrolling in public colleges. Statewide, the number of targeted minority students from these high schools who enrolled in a public college in Fall 1981 increased by 638 over Fall 1980. State University campuses demonstrating particular success on this measure of effectiveness were San Bernardino, Sacramento, and Fullerton. Only two campuses--Stanislaus and Chico--demonstrated a decrease in these numbers. (See Table 6 on page 13 for a campus-by-campus breakdown of these data). It should be noted, however, that only 11 percent of these 638 students enrolled in four-year institutions, which indicates the importance of follow-up services to assist in their transition from two-year to four-year colleges.

Increased Campus Support

The level of campus financial support for the Core Program has increased by approximately 100 percent during the past three years. The ratio of State-designated program funds to institutional funds systemwide has declined from 4/1 in 1980-81 to 2/1 in 1982-83. Between 1980-81 and 1982-83, as Table 1 showed, institutional

TABLE 5 Assessment of Core Outreach Staff and Activities on High School Campuses by School Counselors and Staff

Campus	Number of Schools Served	Number of Schools Contacted	Core Outreach Counselors Were Reliable and Well Trained		Quality of Core Staff Compared to Other Outreach Staff from Local Colleges					Importance of Core Outreach Services to High School Campuses			
			Yes	No	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	No Response	Extremely Useful	Helpful	Unnecessary	No Response
Bakersfield	6	4	4	0	2	2	0	0	0	3	1	0	0
Chico	19	18	18	0	8	7	0	0	3	13	5	0	0
Dominguez Hills	5	5	5	0	3	0	1	0	1	3	2	0	0
Fresno	7	6	6	0	3	2	1	0	0	4	2	0	0
Fullerton	12	12	12	0	8	3	0	0	1	7	5	0	0
Hayward	6	5	5	0	2	3	0	0	0	3	3	0	0
Humboldt	3	2	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
Long Beach	8	7	7	0	7	0	0	0	0	6	1	0	0
Los Angeles	7	6	6	0	4	1	1	0	0	5	1	0	0
Northridge	12	12	10	2	3	6	0	1	2	6	5	0	0
Pomona	11	11	11	0	4	3	1	0	3	7	4	0	0
Sacramento	8	8	8	0	3	5	0	0	0	5	3	0	0
San Bernardino	2	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0
San Diego	10	9	7	2	3	3	1	1	1	3	3	2	1
San Jose	6	5	5	0	4	1	0	0	0	2	3	0	0
Sonoma	9	8	7	1	7	0	0	0	1	6	1	1	0
TOTAL	131	120	115	5	63	37	5	2	13	77	39	3	1
PERCENT			96%	4%	53%	31%	4%	1%	11%	64%	33%	2%	1%

Note: No outreach counseling activities were operated by the Stanislaus, San Luis Obispo, and San Francisco campuses during the 1981-82 year.

Source: California Postsecondary Education Commission.

TABLE 6 College-Going Rates for Underrepresented Ethnic Minority Students Graduating from Secondary Schools Served by the Core Program, Fall 1980 Compared to Fall 1981

Campus	Number of High Schools for Which Data Are Available	Number of Schools with Increase in College-Going Rates	Change in Number of Students Enrolling in UC Campuses	Change in Number of Students Enrolling in CSU Campuses	Change in Number of Students Enrolling in Sponsoring CSU Campus	Change in Number of Students Enrolling in Community Colleges	Change in Number of Students Enrolling in Public Colleges
Bakersfield[1]	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Chico	10	3	-1	+2	+4	-13	-12
Dominguez Hills	6	3	+18	+23	+37	+7	+48
Fresno[1]	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Fullerton	10	8	+2	+1	+1	+104	+107
Hayward	4	2	-5	0	-3	+17	+9
Humboldt	9	9	0	+1	-1	+84	+85
Long Beach	6	4	+4	+6	+16	+46	+56
Los Angeles	6	3	+10	-61	-56	+60	+9
Northridge[2]	5	2	-10	-11	-13	+16	+5
Pomona	6	5	-5	-9	-13	+45	+31
Sacramento	12	7	+1	+43	+49	+89	+133
San Bernardino	6	6	+14	4	0	+150	+168
San Diego	7	6	-6	+2	+2	+100	+96
San Francisco	5	3	+3	+36	+37	-14	+25
San Jose	2	2	+1	+1	+2	+13	+15
San Luis Obispo[3]	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Sonoma	8	4	-2	+1	-1	+24	+24
Stanislaus	8	2	+4	+1	-8	-166	-161
TOTAL	110	69	+28	+40	+53	+562	+638

Note: The underrepresented ethnic minority students included in this analysis are Chicano/Latino and Black students. Only those secondary schools identified as "full-service" schools were included in this analysis.

1. The data for secondary schools served by the Bakersfield and Fresno campuses were not reliable, given a high non-response rate among students attending public two-year colleges in the two areas.

2. The data for some of the secondary schools served by the Northridge campus were not reliable, given a high non-response rate. These schools were not included in this analysis.

3. California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, did not maintain "full-service" outreach efforts at secondary schools in 1980-81.

Source: California Postsecondary Education Commission Information System.

contributions more than doubled, increasing from approximately $400,000 to more than $950,000. The average campus contribution in 1982-83 will be more than $50,000, compared to under $22,000 in 1980-81. The Fresno, Sacramento, and San Luis Obispo campuses will make the largest financial contributions during 1982-83, while San Bernardino, Stanislaus, San Jose, and Bakersfield make the smallest contribution, relative to the size of their grant from the Chancellor's Office.

Coordination of Campus Outreach Efforts

While progress has been made on most campuses in the coordination of outreach activities by their three outreach programs (Educational Opportunity Programs, Office of School Relations, and Student Affirmative Action) considerable room exists for further improvement. On most campuses, each of the three offices operate an independent outreach effort coordinated through a "master calendar" designed to eliminate unintended duplication of visits by representatives of the three offices to the same high school at the same time. This master calendar procedure has helped to reduce overlapping outreach duplicative services among the three programs. Thus far, however, most campuses have not moved to full scale coordination, in which the resources of each office are combined and then cooperatively allocated to serve the prospective student population most effectively. The San Diego campus seems to have taken the lead in coordination, establishing an Office of Student Outreach Services which combines the recruitment unit of Educational Opportunity Programs with the Office of School and College Relations and the outreach unit of the Core program. All staff within this office are trained to provide all outreach functions, and the campus thus in effect has one office responsible for outreach rather than three, in contrast to most other State University campuses. As a result of this organizational structure, San Diego campus staff report that they are able to serve more schools and therefore more students than previously.

Intersegmental Coordination of Outreach

While the Chancellor's Office places considerable emphasis on intersegmental coordination of outreach, progress in this area on the campus level has been unsatisfactory. Each of the campuses has established an advisory committee including representation from service area Community Colleges, University of California campuses, and independent colleges as a means of promoting intersegmental efforts, as directed by the Chancellor's Office. But less than half of the committees include representation from the University of California, and six do not include representatives from local community colleges. And although some campuses, such as Long Beach

and San Diego, have coordinated these outreach efforts through their existing Cal-SOAP projects, others--such as San Jose--have not participated in these existing intersegmental efforts. In short, while some of the campuses have made progress in coordinating their outreach efforts with those offered by other institutions, other campuses have inadequate communication and coordination with outreach efforts sponsored by neighboring colleges.

STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM

The Core Program has several unique aspects which have contributed to its general progress during the past two years.

1. Total Institutional Involvement in Affirmative Action

The Chancellor's Office has defined Core Student Affirmative Action as a "permanent, institutionalized, university-wide effort," involving "all components and constituencies" within the State University. In order to promote this objective, the criteria utilized by the Chancellor's Office for awarding funds include (1) evidence of commitment and involvement by senior administrators and faculty, (2) adequate office space, (3) evidence of involvement and coordination of campus resources and personnel, and (4) placement of the responsibility for program oversight with the academic side of the institution. Progress toward this objective among the State University campuses has been uneven. Some campuses--such as Pomona and Stanislaus--have not begun to develop an institution-wide effort, while others--such as Sacramento and Fullerton--are demonstrating considerable success. However, the majority of the campuses seem to be making some progress in this area.

2. Allocation of State Money to Those Campuses Making the Most Progress and Demonstrating the Strongest Commitment

In order to receive Core funds, each campus is required annually to prepare and submit a detailed description of accomplishments during the current year and a proposal for activities during the coming year. All proposals are reviewed and ranked by a reader panel. Those campuses that are unsuccessful during one year receive considerably smaller grants during the following year. For example, San Luis Obispo and San Francisco received planning grants of only $30,000 in 1981-82 in order to assist them in developing more effective programs than in 1980-81. As a result of their productive planning, in 1982-83 they will receive $130,000 and $100,000, respectively, to implement these plans. In 1982-83, Stanislaus is

scheduled to receive only $50,000--the smallest of any award. In contrast, Sacramento, Fullerton, and Fresno are considered by the Chancellor's Office to have made the most progress in implementing a comprehensive Core effort, and consequently they will receive the largest State allocations.

3. Annual Publication of Comprehensive Information About the Program

The Chancellor's Office has implemented a comprehensive Core SAA data management system which requires that each campus gather specific data about all students served in outreach, retention, and educational enhancement activities. These data, which are generally comparable among all of the campuses, are published in the winter of each year about activities during the preceding academic year. The availability of these data facilitates effective budget review during the following months. In addition, the Chancellor's Office annually publishes the specific goals and objectives of each campus' Core effort as well as a listing of the secondary schools and Community Colleges to be served. The availability of this information facilitates intersegmental coordination.

4. Outreach Efforts in Rural Areas

Some State University campuses, such as San Bernardino and Fresno, have been particularly successful in establishing outreach efforts in rural secondary schools that are generally ignored by most college outreach programs. Because of long distances for travel to remote rural schools and the relatively small size of these schools' student bodies (and therefore high costs per student served), colleges tend to concentrate recruitment efforts for low-income, ethnic minority students in urban or suburban areas. For example, the Core Program at San Bernardino is the only college-based outreach program serving either the Coachella Valley or Indio High Schools. The number of minority students from these schools enrolling in postsecondary institutions (particularly at the two-year College of the Desert) has increased considerably because of San Bernardino's efforts.

5. Use of Successful Non-Traditional Outreach Strategies

The Core Program has utilized several outreach strategies which differ considerably from those used by the staff of the Office of School Relations on the State University campuses. The most important include (1) placing college employees in the high school on a regularly scheduled weekly basis; (2) using college students as counselor aides to work with the high school students as "peer

advisors"; (3) involving parents and other family members in the college preparation and application process through home visits and community events; and (4) involving college students in cultural activities such as drama skits to communicate with high school students about such issues as college apprehensions and peer pressure. Data from the Chancellor's Office indicate that more than 42,000 secondary school students were served by such Core outreach efforts in 1981-82. It is expected that these efforts will have an impact on the existing high school students as well as on their younger brothers and sisters, thereby having the long-run effect of increasing college-going rates among ethnic minority groups.

AREAS WHERE FURTHER PROGRESS IS NEEDED

As a new systemwide effort to coordinate and deliver effective outreach and support services to students underrepresented in the State University, the Core Program has been effectively implemented and there are preliminary indications of the effectiveness of this approach. However, some areas require additional effort by the Chancellor's Office in order to further improve the program. These areas will be addressed in greater detail in the final Commission evaluation of Core, but five can be noted here:

1. Conflict Between Core as a Comprehensive Concept and as Separate Services

As established by the Chancellor's Office, Core "represents the total process, philosophy, and perspective that is adopted by all components and constituencies within a university in order to make student affirmative action a permanent, integral part of a campus." Within this context, Core seeks to involve the entire institution in responding to the educational background and needs of all students eligible to enroll in the State University, rather than establishing a separate programmatic identity to serve underrepresented minority students. At the same time, however, Core is being established on almost all State University campuses as a separate outreach and retention effort, distinct from existing outreach and retention services. To the extent that Core is implemented as a distinct set of services, its concept as a total institutional effort is weakened. The Chancellor's Office is aware of this inconsistency concerning Core and is working to coordinate all existing campus services in order to make them more responsive to minority students.

2. Similarity of Outreach Services Provided by Core and EOP

The distinctive roles of outreach services provided by Core Student Affirmative Action and the Educational Opportunity Program are unclear on many campuses. One prominent difference in outreach functions between these two programs is that SAA serves only regularly admissible students and EOP serves both regular and exception-admit students. Since both serve regularly admissible students, there is overlap of target constituencies and competition in outreach efforts between EOP and SAA. Since the Office of Relations with Schools (ORS) also serves regularly admissible students regardless of ethnicity, it compounds the problem of overlap and coordination. The Chancellor's Office should address the question of why these two programs, as well as the staff of the Office of School Relations, should maintain separate outreach efforts on each campus. In order to promote a more efficient utilization of resources, improved articulation of services among these three programs is needed.

3. Unclear Objective of Core Outreach on Some Campuses

Most of the campus staff involved in Core outreach perceive their primary objective as that of increasing the number of underrepresented ethnic minority students who enroll in postsecondary education. On some campuses, however, they seek primarily to increase the number of these students who enroll at that specific campus. Materials about Core from the Chancellor's Office seem to emphasize the boarder goal of postsecondary enrollment generally, with each campus credited for assisting students to enroll in Community Colleges, University of California campuses, and other State University campuses. This uncertainty should be clarified, with all campuses notified that the goal of Core is not campus recruitment but instead increased enrollment of Chicanos, Blacks, and American Indians in postsecondary institutions generally.

4. Time Consuming and Unnecessary Annual Funding

During each of the past three years, campuses have been directed to prepare lengthy proposals as part of the competitive review process used in the allocation of State funds among the 19 campuses. This process has had several positive effects, as discussed above, but it has involved considerable time by campus staff in writing annual proposals. Since the program is now entering its third year and some campuses have established a successful record, the proposal review process might be revised to include three-year funding cycles for successful projects, so that more staff time on these campuses can be allocated to serving students rather than drafting proposals.

5. Inadequate Implementation of a Comprehensive Effort on Some Campuses

Core is designed to include outreach, retention, and faculty in-service training components. Thus far, most campuses have emphasized the first two of these components. Some campuses, however, have focused almost exclusively on outreach and directed little attention toward improving the retention rate among ethnic minority students. During the coming year, all campuses should implement a more comprehensive student affirmative action effort which should have the long-run effect of increasing the numbers of students who graduate. In the next evaluation of the Core Program, the Commission staff will review at some length each campus's progress in this direction.

SUMMARY

The Core Student Affirmative Action Program of the California State University has been in operation for almost two years. Commission staff review of the program thus far leads to the following conclusions:

- Almost all of the 19 State University campuses have made progress in implementing the Core Program. This progress reflects the involvement of senior campus administrators and faculty as well as strong administrative support from the Chancellor's Office.

- The outreach component of the Core Program has been positively received by high school counselors and staff, who regard the Core staff as reliable, well-trained, and effective. Available data indicate that increasing numbers of minority students from secondary schools served by the Core Program are enrolling in college.

- Better coordination of the outreach programs on most State University campuses is needed. The establishment of Core outreach has meant that three different offices now provide outreach services on most of these campuses. Better coordination among these offices will increase the effective use of the limited resources available for this function. The Office of Student Outreach Services on the San Diego State University campus provides a model for outreach coordination that other campuses might well adopt.

- Most State University campuses have not succeeded in establishing intersegmental outreach efforts. The Chancellor's Office has prescribed that each campus create a Student Affirmative Action

Advisory Committee designed to coordinate activities among colleges within the region. These committees have generally been ineffective in the achievement of that objective, and most State University outreach staff have only limited contact with their University of California colleagues.

- Finally, the Chancellor's Office has developed an effective process for distributing State funds to those campuses making the most progress in implementing the Core Program. Its competitive grant approach has stimulated institutional efforts at student affirmative action, rewarded those campuses' that demonstrate high commitment and successful efforts, and penalized those with lower commitment and success. As the Core Program moves into its third year, the funding cycle for campuses with successful programs might be expanded to three years in order to retain the program's competitive element while reducing time-consuming proposal preparation on these campuses.

These conclusions stem from a preliminary review of the Core Program. The Commission's final evaluation, to be submitted to the Legislature in Fall 1983, will include further conclusions as well as recommendations on many of the issues discussed above. Nonetheless, it is already evident that the Core Program is achieving many of its intended goals on many State University campuses.